



## Developing a Newcastle Stakeholder Map

On 14<sup>th</sup> February at the introductory meeting where establishing a Learning and Action Alliance (LAA) for Blue-Green approaches to Flood Risk Management (FRM) in Newcastle was proposed, a workshop was also run to discuss developing a Newcastle Stakeholder Map. The main objectives were:

1. To list any stakeholders that were not at the start-up workshop (Feb 14<sup>th</sup>) but that play a key role in Newcastle FRM and the creation of a Blue-Green vision, and so should be represented in the LAA, e.g. Highways Agency, Your Homes Newcastle and Newcastle Science Central;
2. To discuss the relationships between key stakeholders and develop a draft stakeholder map that was presented to the groups, to show the different levels of influence and responsibility regarding implementation of Blue-Green infrastructure.

The initial draft map was simply a vehicle for discussion, suggesting a simple typology of different actors with regard to Blue-Green FRM in Newcastle. It was then important to engage other experts with different knowledge from across the city to revise and redraft the map to ensure it was representative and agreed upon.

Legend for the original map:

- Green represented key actors, driving influences or 'gatekeepers' through which others may have to pass in order to establish Blue-Green FRM;
- Orange represented agents occupying or owning large amounts of land;
- Yellow represented agents occupying or owning small amounts of land (although collectively they may represent large amounts);
- Grey represented other actors I felt would be very relevant, but was unsure as to where they should be placed.

Importantly, the image was not intended to represent a hierarchy but simply a typology of actors to think through who had capacity to act or interest in acting.

### Question

**The important question now is what do you think - which stakeholders do you think should be seen as having greater or lesser capacity to act and so should be coded differently?**

**A second and related question would be: Do you think that the map should be structured differently?**

We will welcome all suggestions, and are already working on some ideas from the first meeting; this stakeholder map is still a working draft.

## Feedback from Workshop

A number of suggestions were made for amending the colour-codes on the map, outlined below:

### Green

- Added:
  - Northumbrian Water (5 tables)
  - Newcastle University (3 tables)
  - Freemen of Newcastle Upon Tyne (2 tables)
  - National Government (1 table)
  - Natural England (1 table)
  
- The role of the Freemen of Newcastle Upon Tyne was argued to be more direct than had been indicated; strong interactions with Newcastle City Council (NCC), Northumbrian Water and Communities, as well as implementing their own Blue-Green infrastructure; in this way, two tables argued that they should be Green;
- Natural England were also argued to be Green by one table, advising NCC and driving action (being a national statutory body like the Environment Agency (EA));
- Northumbrian Water was moved to Green by 4 tables, and Newcastle University by 2, as agents for change (one table noted that in their instance the moving of Northumbrian Water was an EA view, not held all-round the table);
- The Green position of the EA was noted to depend in part upon changing responsibilities due to restructuring; this is something that would advisedly remain an open point of discussion with EA participants.

### Orange

- Added:
  - Highways Agency
  - Railways (station)
  - Nexus Travel
  - Airport
  - Northumbria University
  - Retail Consortium
  - Newcastle-Gateshead Initiative / Partnership
  - NHS / hospitals
  - NGOs: Wildlife Trusts, Rivers Trust

### Yellow

- Added:
  - Schools
  - National developers
  - (one table moved Community to Green)

### Grey

- Added:
  - CIWEM
  - ICE
  - RICS
  - Other professional bodies
- Removed or questioned:
  - Insurers (1 table)
  - FRM Consultants (2 tables)
- The position of insurers was questioned by one table, and the position of 'FRM Consultants' by 2;
- A series of extra contacts were suggested by different tables which the core LAA group will discuss at the first meeting (8th April).

### Alternative Map Design Suggestions

The layout of the image was still felt to portray something hierarchical, and so many agreed that this needed to change.

- A circular form was suggested by a few people, with Blue-Green FRM situated in the centre and agents placed around this with varying degrees of proximity;
- A matrix strategy was proposed as another alternative: Influence and Responsibility, High-Medium-Low;
- A layer cake approach was suggested by another table; this would allow for locational specificity – if each layer specifies the geographical responsibility, agency and interests of actors within it, then when viewed 'top-down' for any particular catchment, the relevant agents would be clearly marked.

### What happens next?

WP2c will rework the stakeholder map based on feedback from the workshop groups. The new map will be uploaded to the LAA webpage and linked from the LinkedIn group; further comments upon the map can then be directed to [glyn.everett@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:glyn.everett@uwe.ac.uk).